



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,834	09/19/2003	Bjorn Bjare	P17551-US2	6032
27045	7590	01/11/2008	EXAMINER	
ERICSSON INC.			VU, TUAN A	
6300 LEGACY DRIVE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
M/S EVR 1-C-11			2193	
PLANO, TX 75024			MAIL DATE	
			01/11/2008	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/665,834	BJARE ET AL.
	Examiner Tuan A. Vu	Art Unit 2193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2007.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 23-44 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 23-44 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/ are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the Applicant's response filed 10/31/07.

As indicated in Applicant's response, claims 1-22 have been canceled. Claims 23-44 are added and pending in the office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Specifically, claim 39 recites 'customer comprises an end user product manufacturer'; and in light of the recited 'customer of a provider' in claim 38, one of ordinary skill in the art cannot find a corresponding part in the Specifications that would clearly conveys that such very provider-associated customer is also a product manufacturer. The disclosure teaches about manufacturer with alternatives as to provide either full-blown mobile software functionality or core functional basic provision thereof to end users along possibility to follow up with subsequent plug-ins for extending that core provision; but nowhere in the Disclosure is there a passage that allow using plug-ins by a manufacturer (as a customer) to extend functionality of this end-user device, as recited in claim 39 – that is, product manufacturer being an end-user (*customer of a provider*). The above lack of description fails to comply with the requirement of

a USC § 112, 1st paragraph; that is, it is deemed that the inventor does not possess such limitation, hence claim 39 will not be treated with any patentable weight. The manufacturer would be treated as a mere manufacturer or provider-related product end user. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 23-26, 29-34, 37-39, 41-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuhn, USPN: 6,961,567 (hereinafter Kuhn) and further in view of Allor, USPubN: 20030226102 (hereinafter Allor)

As per claim 23, Kuhn discloses a mobile terminal for use in a wireless telecommunications system comprising:

a mobile terminal; a mobile terminal platform domain (e.g. Fig. 1) having a software services component for providing functionality, said software services component in the form of software instructions adapted to be loaded and stored in a computer readable medium (col. 4, lines 2-6) and executed by a processor of the mobile terminal,

the mobile terminal platform domain further having an interface component having at least one interface for providing access to the functionality of the software services component for enabling an application domain software to be loaded and run in said mobile terminal platform via said at least one interface (e.g. *icon, launch ... interaction, perform tasks, number of*

screens - col. 5, lines 24-45), said interface component in the form of software instructions adapted to be loaded and stored in a computer readable medium (col. 5, line 65 to col. 6, line 6) and executed by a processor; and

plug-in software in the form of software instructions adapted to be loaded and stored in a computer readable medium and executed by the processor of the mobile terminal for use by the application domain software for modifying the functionality of the software services component (e.g. plug-in 204 – Fig. 2; *deactivation* - col. 6, lines 31-47, lines 57-65; *switch between ... carriers; changing computer's compatibility for different carrier ... providers* - col. 7, lines 29-61) of the mobile terminal platform domain via the at least one interface.

But Kuhn does not explicitly disclose an interface component for enabling application software to be installed. Kuhn's HTTP application (see Fig. 3, 5A-B and related text) is depicted with extensive use of plug-in being invoked for setting features, downloading (see *registration file 208* – Table 1, col 8, col. 9, lines 1-25) and detecting error conditions (see col. 6, lines 57-65) with regard to a service provider type of activation. This Web-based remote activation is further enhanced with the analogous use of plug-in by Allor, according to which, a extensible tag functionality from a plug-in module can be used to support installation of components via callback information in a browser interface (installation – para 0048, pg. 5). It would have been obvious for one skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the browser environment plug-in by Kuhn so that the plug-in can support validating and warning of errors in support of **installation** of components for a particular provider domain application, based on, for example, Allor's teachings in using plug-in tag indicator and callback information; because embedded content or browser functionality in Kuhn's provider-specific Web services can be

installed and would be deployed using the ready-to-use or provided plug-in for such browsers, alleviating thereby resources that would require additional developing of program native code, such that extensibility of browser capabilities and content display had been known to be supported by ready-to-use plug-ins (see Allor, pg. 1, para 0004-0005)

As per claim 24, Kuhn discloses wherein said at least one interface comprises an application programming interface (e.g. API's – col. 5, lines 55-64).

As per claims 25-26, Kuhn discloses wherein said plug-in software comprises software residing in a domain of said application software (e.g. particular carrier ... service provider – col 6, lines 50-65) and that uses the functionality of at least one of the platform domain (col. 7, lines 13-49) and other plug-in software (e.g. *plug-in ... compatible with each other* – col. 7, lines 50-60; col. 6, lines 50-56);

wherein said plug-in software complies with a same paradigm as provided services (e.g. col. 6, lines 7-16; carrier and service ... intended for that plug-in – col. 4, line 56 to col. 5, line 4) exported by said application programming interface.

As per claims 29-30, Kuhn discloses wherein said plug-in software includes a plurality of plug-in software modules (refer to claim 23); wherein said plug-in software includes plug-in software defining a set of graphical objects and utilities for defining a particular aspect of the environment, i.e. locality or language specific parameters (e.g. language – col. 7, lines 29-49; *changing computer's compatibility for different carrier ... providers* - col. 7, lines 29-61; language – col. 7, lines 29-49). But Kuhn does not disclose that such environment parameters being modified are for looks and feel. But based on such ability to customize the mobile device environment by Kuhn, it would have been obvious for one skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to implement Kuhn's plug-in so that these plug-in can also enable the user to modify the looks and feels of the browser in which the plug-in operate to rectify discrepancies that would arise from incompatible locality or platform within which Kuhn's Web applications operate or are graphically rendered.

As per claim 31, Kuhn discloses wherein said platform domain comprises a platform for a mobile terminal for a wireless telecommunications system (refer to claim 23).

As per claim 32, Kuhn discloses a method for use in a mobile terminal, comprising:
providing a mobile terminal platform domain having a software services component for providing functionality, said software services component in the form of software instructions adapted to be loaded and stored in a computer readable medium and executed by a processor in the mobile terminal;

providing an interface component in said mobile terminal platform domain having at least one interface for providing access to the functionality of the software services component for enabling an application domain software to be loaded and run in said mobile terminal platform via said at least one interface, said interface component in the form of software instructions adapted to be loaded and stored in a computer readable medium and executed by the processor of the mobile terminal;

providing plug-in software in the form of software instructions adapted to be loaded and stored in a computer readable medium and executed by the processor of the mobile terminal and together with the application software for modifying the functionality of the software services component of the mobile terminal platform domain via the at least one interface; and modifying the functionality of the software services component via said plug-in software;

all of which limitations having been addressed in claim 23.

But Kuhn does not explicitly disclose an interface component for enabling application domain software to be installed. However, this limitation has been addressed in claim 23.

As per claims 33, 34, these claims include respectively the subject matter of claims 25-27; hence incorporate the corresponding rejection as set forth therein.

As per claim 37, this claim will incorporate the same rationale as set forth in claim 30.

As per claims 38-39, Kuhn discloses a end user being a manufacturer product end user using the wireless product and able modify the functionality using plug-ins (see claim 33; Fig 1-2).

As per claims 41 and 44, Kuhn discloses wherein said step of modifying the functionality comprises adding or removing functionality to said software services component of said platform (*deactivation* - col. 6, lines 31-47, lines 57-65; *switch between ... carriers*; *changing computer's compatibility for different carrier ... providers* - col. 7, lines 29-61; step 405 – Fig 5A); wherein said step of modifying the functionality is performed by downloading at least one plug-in (refer to claim 23).

As per claim 42, Kuhn discloses a platform for a mobile terminal for a wireless telecommunications system (col. 7, lines 16-25).

As per claim 43, Kuhn discloses wherein said step of modifying the functionality is performed by downloading an application (see *registration file 208* – Table 1, col 8, col. 9, lines 1-25).

6. Claims 27-28, 35-36, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuhn, USPN: 6,961,567 and Allor, USPubN: 20030226102, further in view of Stewart et al, USPubN: 2001/0039570 (hereinafter Stewart)

As per claims 27-28, Kuhn discloses browser based applications in the realm of mobile devices allowing user to receive files or email or various environmental resources from their being connected to their provider (see col. 2, lines 26-35; col. 11, lines 18-30) with capability such as naming convention compliance (step 424, 434 – Fig. 5B) and provisioning with undesired-event handling compliance (see step 410, Fig. 5A; step 436 – Fig. 5B) but does not explicitly disclose wherein said provided services include one or more of component model compliance, and message model compliance; wherein said message model includes a callback mode and a full message mode.

The paradigm using a mobile service provider with web communications allowing the mobile user to retrieve data, files and Email messages was a known concept (see Allor: para 0041, para 0045- pg. 4) at the time the invention was made. Based on Allor's message and call back information, it would have been obvious for one skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Kuhn's browser communication so that compliance to receiving application data from the network comprise callback-based messages or full message mode (see Allor – claim 23) because either mode can support the browser usability or modifying/extending its functionality according Allor's approach with its benefits as set forth in claim 1.

Likewise, Stewart, in a enterprise-based system using plug-in type of modules (Stewart: Fig. 7-9) to provide functionality to Web/HTTP mobile/PDA type of users (*wireless* – para 0278, pg. 16) like those in Kuhn or Allor, discloses wire-protocol and messaging capabilities for

encapsulating business process/workflow in a HTTP request to implement a business transaction framework including compliancy to a model (e.g. para 0348, pg. 18), with message model compliancy of HTTP or SOAP (e.g. para 0349, pg. 18). Based on the well-known paradigm of HTTP, and Java-based client-server communications and middleware services between provider, database and end users, it would have been obvious for one skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the Web-based services communicated between the provider and the mobile platform as set forth by Kuhn and/or Allor, so that Web transactions (e.g. B2B) type application using mobile technology can be implemented according to a model framework with use of SOAP protocol and workflow model compliancy as taught by Stewart. One would be motivated to do so because Web transactions for supporting mobile technology at the time the invention was made for enabling data such as in Kuhn's paradigm transmission of resources or Web-based transaction or business (based on Stewart's model and messaging) to reach registered end users (like Kuhn's and Allor's) for enabling customizing of a transaction via utilizing the extensibility of the model support and messaging protocol as set forth above (refer to claim 27).

As per claims 35, 36, these claims include respectively the subject matter of claims 27, 28; hence incorporate the corresponding rejection as set forth therein.

As per claim 40, Kuhn does not explicitly disclose wherein said step of modifying the functionality is performed by a third party contracted to change the functionality. But based on the rationale as set forth in claim 26, middleware services for collaborating workflow in various type of Web-based transactions involving provider, SOAP interface, COM/Corba middle-tiers, trading partners and interconnecting services with RDBMs has been taught as well-known by Stewart (see Fig. 1-2, 4, 8-25) according to which modeling framework and messaging are

instrumental for allowing the provider-based web users to extend the client environment application. Based on the concept of third party (see Stewart: COM, Corba - para 0075, pg. 6) for collaborating different tiers and partners in a B2B workflow applications, it would have been obvious for one skill in the art at the time the invention was made to enable Kuhn's mobile device network to use the third party services with capabilities to modify message/extensible data (Java, XML or SOAP protocol) and reroute application data to other collaborating trade partners or servers, in order to achieve this multi-partners business-to-business type of workflow or model-based process in form of application extension as purported in Kuhn network.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments regarding claims 1-22 and filed 10/31/07 have been fully considered but they are moot in light of the new grounds of rejection which have been necessitated by the Amendments.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan A Vu whose telephone number is (571) 272-3735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-4:30PM/Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571)272-3756.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-3735 (for non-official correspondence - please consult Examiner before using) or 571-273-8300 (for official correspondence) or redirected to customer service at 571-272-3609.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Tuan A Vu
Patent Examiner,

TUAN VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit 2193

January 9, 2008